

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested. Claims 1-14 and 21-26 are in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, and 12 have been amended. (Claims 4, 7, 9, and 12 were amended to correct inadvertent errors.) Claims 15-20 have been cancelled. Claims 21-26 have been added to alternately and additionally claim the present invention.

Applicant requests the Examiner to indicate whether the substitute formal drawings filed on July 31, 2003 (and received by the PTO on August 4, 2003) have been entered into the application. Applicant notes that in the next communication following receipt of the drawings, applicant is to be notified by the Examiner if the drawings have been entered and, if not entered, applicant should receive an explanation as to why the drawings were not entered. (See MPEP §608.02(h).)

In addition, applicant requests the Examiner to initial and return a copy of the Form 1449 that applicant submitted with an IDS with the initial filing of the patent application.

The Examiner noted that a Background of the Invention section and a Summary of the Invention section should be included in the specification. Applicant acknowledges the traditional format of a patent application, but notes that the patent laws and patent rules do not require the inclusion of these sections. As a result, applicant has opted to omit these sections.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lampaert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,942). For the reasons set forth below, applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as applied to amended claim 1.

Amended claim 1 recites, in part:

"a metal structure formed directly over the plurality of second conductivity strips, the metal structure including a plurality of spaced-apart first metal strips that are electrically connected to the drain strips, the

plurality of first metal strips having widths, lengths, and thicknesses such that each first metal strip has a width, a length that is substantially longer than the width, and a thickness measured normal to the top surface of the semiconductor material, the widths of the first metal strips being different."

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner pointed to drain contact strips 640, 644, and 648 shown in FIG. 6 of Lampaert as constituting the first metal strips required by claim 1. The Lampaert reference, however, totally fails to teach or suggest that the widths of the drain contact strips 640, 644, and 648 are different.

As shown in FIG. 6, Lampaert teaches that the drain contact strips 640, 644, and 648 have substantially equal widths. Similarly, FIG. 6 of Lampaert also teaches that the source contact strips 622, 626, 630, and 634 have substantially equal widths. Thus, since the Lampaert reference fails to teach or suggest first metal strips with different widths, amended claim 1 is not anticipated by the Lampaert reference. In addition, claims 21-26 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1. As a result, claims 21-26 are not anticipated by Lampaert for the same reasons as claim 1.

The Examiner objected to claims 2-14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but indicated that claims 2-14 would be allowable if amended to be in independent format to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 2 has been amended to be in independent format, and is believed to include all of the necessary limitations. Claims 3-14 have not been put into independent format as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from amended claim 2.

Thus, for the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in a condition for allowance. Therefore, the Examiner's early re-examination and reconsideration are respectively requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12-15-04

By: Mark C. Pickering
Mark C. Pickering
Registration No. 36,239
Attorney for Assignee

P.O. Box 300
Petaluma, CA 94953-0300
Telephone: (707) 762-5500
Facsimile: (707) 762-5504
Customer No.: 33402